

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Trip Report, Recreation Management Support Program (RMSP) Spring 2000 Meeting

1. The subject meeting was held on 10-12 April 2000 at Fort Belvoir, VA. An agenda and participant list is provided (attachment 1). The meeting was brought to order by Mr. Tom Peek, Chair, RMSP Leadership Team. The primary purpose of the meeting was to: a) review the status of items included in the Recreation Business Area Action Plan and RMSP work plan, b) provide input to the Recreation Trends and Benefits work units, and c) recommend topics for the preparation of Statements of Need and Study Plans.
2. Mr. Peek presented a status report on FY00 actions associated with the Recreation Business Area Action Plan. Mr. Darrell Lewis discussed major issues being addressed by HQ.
3. Messrs. Richard Kasul and Dale Brown facilitated a session to identify priorities for the recreation trends work unit. The RMSP team was divided into HQ, Division, District, and Project Groups. Each group deliberated on priorities. Each group presented their results and a consolidated list of priorities was developed (attachment 2). The recommended priorities will be used to develop a proposed approach for monitoring CE recreation trends that will be presented at the RMSP fall meeting. Mr. John Marnell is providing oversight on this activity as the proponent.
4. Mr. Scott Jackson presented a status report on funded work units (attachment 3). The total FY 00 RMSP budget is \$785K. Adjustments to the FY00 work plan budget and milestone schedule were made to accommodate the \$215K funding shortfall and phased receipt of funds.
5. Ms. Susan Shampine and Ms. Kathleen Perales presented an initial concept for a website to support the CE Recreation Business Area. There was considerable discussion about potential uses for the site and specific suggestions about content areas that needed to be included. There was consensus among the team that natural resources needed to be addressed in the website in addition to recreation. The following team members volunteered to participate in a working group on this activity: Ms. Shampine (proponent), Mr. Jimmy Carver, Dr. Mike Loesch, Mr. Peek, Mr. Will Rogers, and Ms. Sandy Campbell. The working group will be contacted in the near future to participate in future activities.

CEERD-EN-R

SUBJECT: Trip Report, Recreation Management Support Program (RMSP) Spring 2000 Meeting

6. Ms. Perales and Mr. Jackson presented an overview of the Recreation Benefits work unit. The focus of the presentation was the preparation of a document that showcases outcome-oriented CE recreation programs and provides an overview of the program at national and division scales. It was agreed that a working group would be formed to assist the proponent providing guidance to the work unit and acquiring information on recreation programs. The following team members volunteered to participate in a working group for this activity: Mr. Don Dunwoody (proponent) Mr. Peek, Mr. Carver, Ms. Campbell, Mr. Loesch, Mr. Dave Wahus, Mr. John Marnell, Mr. Phil Turner, Mr. Joe Sigrest. Follow up contact will be made to this group on future activities.

7. Two study plans and statements of need will be prepared prior to the fall RMSP meeting to address research requirements in the areas of recreation carrying capacity and recreation needs of ethnic visitors. These actions are a result of deliberations by the team led by Mr. Brown to identify issues affecting the CE recreation program. The results were organized into two groups. Those topics that could be addressed through research and those that were not research oriented. Ten researchable issues identified by the team were prioritized. The results (unedited to ensure that we retain information for future reference) of this session are provided (attachment 4). a) The highest priority topic identified by the team was recreation carrying capacity. There were three specific issues (numbers 3, 6, and 28) identified by the team related to carrying capacity, i.e. conflicts with personal watercraft, density of development and density of visitors". Mr. Peek, Ms. Campbell, and Mr. Rogers volunteered to prepare a statement of need on carrying capacity and coordinate with staff preparing the study plan on this topic. b) The second highest priority issue was to address the recreation needs of traditional and non-traditional ethnic visitors. This would be an extension of recently completed work in this area. Mr. Loesch presented a summary of the statement of need on this issue that was prepared last year. Messrs. Turner and Loesch volunteered to serve as co-proponents for his work. They will review and revise as necessary the existing statement of need and coordinate with Mr. Bob Dunn who will be assigned to prepare the study plan on this topic.

8. Two additional presentations were made on topics related to RMSP activities. Mr. Marnell provided a summary of the recreation facility standards committee. The committee is charged with developing a "band of acceptable recreation facilities and services." The standards will be used to guide the formulation of proposals under the recreation modernization program, major rehabilitation projects and other initiatives involving recreation facilities and services. Dr. Bonnie Bryson presented findings from her dissertation regarding "career plateaus" of CE Natural Resource Management staff and potential impacts on the organization.

CEERD-EN-R

SUBJECT: Trip Report, Recreation Management Support Program (RMSP) Spring 2000 Meeting

9. The team agreed to hold the fall 2000 RMSP meeting in Albuquerque, NM, on 1-3 November 2000. The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Peek at noon 12 April 2000.

Attchs

R SCOTT JACKSON  
Research Biologist

ATTACHMENT 1.

**AGENDA**

**Recreation Management Support Program  
Spring Meeting  
Casey Building, Ft. Belvoir, VA  
April 10-12 2000**

**Monday, April 10**

- 0800 Welcome/Review Meeting Goals – Tom Peek, Dave Wahus
- 0830 Recreation Business Area Action Plan Status Report - Tom Peek
- 0900 Overview of HQ activities Darrell Lewis
- 1000 Break
- 1015 Overview of HQ activities (continued) Darrell Lewis
- 1130 Recreation Trends Richard Kasul, Dale Brown -- (This will be a group activity facilitated by Dale Brown to refine the direction of the trends work unit)
- 1200 Lunch
- 1330 Recreation Trends (continued)
- 1500 Break
- 1515 Recreation Trends (continued)
- 1700 Adjourn

**Tuesday, April 11**

- 0800 Recreation Trends (concluded) Richard Kasul/Dale Brown
- 1000 Break
- 1015 Ongoing RMSP Activities – Scott Jackson
  - Studies**
  - Economic Impacts of Dock and Marina Boaters
  - Recreation Infrastructure
  - Recreation Benefits

**Management Assistance**

Comment Card

**Information Exchange**

VERS/AUPS technical support

Publications

Recreation Benefits –National/Division Profile -- Kathy Perales/Scott Jackson

Website – Susan Shampine/Kathy Perales

1200 Lunch

1330 Identify issues for potential new starts -- Team Members (5 minutes each)

1500 Break

1515 Discussion of issues identified -- Group

1700 Adjourn

**Wednesday, April 12**

0800 Recommend priorities for new Statements of Need and Study Plans -- Group

0900 Recreation Facility/Service Standards Committee -- John Marnell

1000 Break

1015 Career development survey -- Bonnie Bryson

1115 Additional Issues

Fall Meeting time/location etc.

1200 Adjourn

MEETING PARTICIPANTS:

RMSP Leadership Team:

Sandy Campbell CESAS-OP-H  
Jimmy Carver CEMRK-OD-MG-E  
Don Dunwoody CENWD-MR-ET-C  
Scott Jackson CERDC-EN-R  
Mike Loesch CELRD-ET-CO-R  
John Marnell CESWT-OD-TR  
Tom Peek CELRN-CO-CEN-R  
Elisa Pellicciotto CESWD-ETO-R  
Susan Shampine CESP-OD-O  
Joe Sigrest CEMVD-ET-CO  
Dan Troglin CENWP-OP-SR  
Phil Turner CESP-ET-CO  
Dave Wahus CECW-ON-R

Others:

Roger Hamilton CERDC-EN-R  
Richard Kasul CERDC-EN-R  
Darrell Lewis CECW-ON  
Tom McBride CENAD-ET-O  
Kathleen Perales CERDC-EN-R  
Judy Rice CECW-ON  
Will Rogers CENAE-CO-TS  
Mr. George Tabb CECW-ON

## ATTACHMENT 2

### RESULTS OF RECREATION TRENDS SESSION

An understanding of outdoor recreation trends is essential if we are to continue to meet the needs of current Corps recreation visitors and to plan the next generation of facilities for future visitors. Recreation policy, planning, and management are all more effective when sound trend information is available to guide decision-making.

Three information systems are currently used to obtain visitor information for monitoring purposes. Visitation and activity statistics are produced for developed recreation areas using VERS. Campground use and fee statistics were collected using AUPS through 1998 with transition to the NRRS beginning in 1999. Customer Satisfaction data is collected by projects for local use using the Customer Comment Card.

Some of the existing computer technology used in monitoring trends is old (DOS-based) and is considered to be functionally obsolete. With the need to update this technology, there is the opportunity to expand the existing capability to include additional types of visitor information. Recreation managers, administrators, and policy makers in the Corps have previously suggested the need for trend data to meet new information requirements. In addition, new business practices, such as fee collections, and new information technology have created opportunities to revise or add to existing trend monitoring capabilities with less cost and less intrusiveness on both visitors and project staff. As a result of current options and opportunities, it made strategic sense to reexamine our overall trend monitoring information needs before upgrading old technology or developing new capabilities.

During the RMSP spring 2000 meeting, Headquarters recreation staff and the Recreation Leadership Team, collectively referred to below as the leadership, were asked to evaluate the Corps recreation trend monitoring needs and priorities. The leadership developed nine categories of potentially important requirements. Within each category they identified important components, questions, and issues and developed a rationale for their importance (Table 1). Each member of the leadership was then asked to identify the three highest priority information needs. The overall degree of interest in each category was indicated by the number of times each was indicated out of 52 "votes" cast. Results in descending order of interest were as follows:

- 14 Visitor demographics
- 14 Customer service
- 10 Recreation benefits
- 8 Recreation technology
- 4 Ethnicity and disability
- 2 Brand recognition
- 0 Interpretative programs
- 0 Visitor perceptions of Corps' stewardship
- 0 Visitation

**1. Visitor Demographics (14):** Demographic information was examined by the leadership from two perspectives. First, demographic characterization of individuals, visitor parties, and other groups was a requirement needed to help local managers tailor facility and service management programs to the needs of different recreation visitors. Second, demographic information would have implications for overall recreation demand, and was

needed to help assess future demand, and concomitantly, the need for facilities to satisfy a future demand that is expected to be greater than it is today.

To help address these goals, the leadership identified three broad categories of needed demographic information. They included:

- a) characteristics of project visitors in terms of:
  - **activities** – visitation, overall and by activities,
  - **visitor origins**: - defining the market in terms of distances traveled, rural vs suburban vs urban, etc.,
  - **socioeconomic information on individuals and parties** - age, sex, party size, family/structure of parties, ethnic and disabled use, economic status, etc.,
- b) information to identify potential visitors and determine why don't they use Corps projects,
- c) national / regional demographic trend data to help address future recreation demand.

**2. Customer satisfaction (14):** The leadership identified a wide range of management and program information needs that could be addressed using customer satisfaction surveys. Many of those needs are met with the existing customer satisfaction survey capability. To meet other needs, there was support for expanding the current capability to:

- include and distinguish all user groups,
- determine both importance and satisfaction aspects of current amenity and service offerings,
- identify and determine the need (i.e. importance) for facilities and/or services not presently available,
- incorporate natural resource / environmental aspects of satisfaction,
- produce a national estimate of customer satisfaction.

**3. Project Benefits (10).** Public support and funding for Corps recreation programs are ultimately determined by the benefits these programs provide to the nation. The benefits of recreation have traditionally been measured as economic impacts to local and regional economies. The recreation leadership indicated that it was important to continue to measure the economic benefits of recreation opportunity provided by the Corps. The leadership also recognized that outdoor recreation provided important non-monetary benefits. They indicated support for efforts to identify and measure non-monetary benefits important to communities, partners, and other governmental and non-governmental supporters of the Corps outdoor recreation programs. Documentation of non-monetary benefits was judged to be valuable for marketing and outreach programs.

**4. Recreation Technology (8).** Corps facilities were designed to support recreation equipment in use 20 or more years ago. The changes in recreational equipment since this time are causing some types of Corps facilities to approach a state of functional obsolescence. It was noted, for example, that many RV campers in use today require larger pads and higher amperage electrical service than is currently available in Corps campgrounds. The leadership indicated that evaluation of recreation facility needs would benefit from information on the types and characteristics of boats, campers, and other equipment used by project visitors, from an assessment of future trends in recreation equipment, and from a determination of facility requirements to support modern recreation equipment.



**5. Ethnicity and Disability (4).** While ethnicity and disability were identified previously as demographic considerations of interest, they are identified here in a separate category to emphasize their importance as demographic populations of special interest and concern. In addition, to basic demographic information, the leadership team expressed a desire for more detailed information on the characteristics of these populations, on barriers to their use of Corps projects, and for more extensive information regarding their preferences for recreation activities, services, and facilities.

**6. Brand Recognition (2).** Name recognition is important in building support for the Corps recreation program. In addition, it is an important consideration in marketing, partnering, and other program activities. The leadership indicated that it would be useful to document the degree to which visitors recognize the Corps role in providing recreation, to determine the degree of name recognition differs among visitor segments, and the importance of name recognition in making personal recreation decisions.

**7. Other Information (0).** Three other categories of information needs were presented and discussed. One involved determining the cost effectiveness of interpretative programs. This could be regarded as a benefits issue. The second involved determining visitor perceptions of the Corps as natural resource stewards. It was determined that these perceptions could be considered a dimension of customer satisfaction. The third involved measurement of visitation and determination of origin-destination information from selected visitation data. The leadership team indicated that visitation was regarded as the necessary starting point for obtaining demographic and other visitor statistics. Visitation was the one assumed given of all the potential information needs.

Table 1. Summary of Trend Monitoring Information Needs Identified by Headquarters and the Recreation Leadership Team.

Trend Information Category	Degree Of Interest <sup>1</sup>	Components/Questions / Issues That Need To Be Addressed	Rationale/Use of Information
Visitor Demographics	14	<p>Components of visitor use, e.g. number of vehicles, party size (Proj)</p> <p>Visitor origins (Proj, Div, HQ)</p> <p>Camping style preferences (Proj)</p> <p>Basic demographic information on users such as age, gender, etc (Proj, Dist)</p> <p>Socioeconomic characteristics of visitors such as education, occupation, income, ethnicity, etc (Proj, Div)</p> <p>Identify and understand needs of visitors relative to ethnicity and family structure, etc (Dist)</p> <p>Effect that number of generations that family has been in U.S. has on recreation activities and demand (Dist)</p> <p>Effect of early affluence on recreation choices (Proj, Dist)</p> <p>Identify use by special populations associated with ethnicity, disability, etc. (Div)</p> <p>Origins of visitors in terms of local vs non-local, rural-suburban-urban (Div)</p> <p>Regional/national changes in population and socioeconomic conditions (HQ)</p> <p>Demand implications for different demographic groups – e.g. age, ethnicity, gender, disability (HQ)</p>	<p>Identify customer (Proj)</p> <p>Help determine facility/service needs (Proj)</p> <p>Future recreation area design (Dist)</p> <p>Needed to focus future of program, develop modernization strategy, etc. (Div)</p> <p>Resource allocation, budget priorities (Div HQ)</p> <p>Need to be inclusive in programs to accommodate national demand (HQ)</p> <p>Track changes in market areas; better serve national market for outdoor recreation (HQ)</p>

Trend Information Category	Degree Of Interest <sup>1</sup>	Components/Questions / Issues That Need To Be Addressed	Rationale/Use of Information
Customer satisfaction	14	<p>Adequacy of amenities and services (Proj)</p> <p>Visitor recommendations for improvements (Proj, Div)</p> <p>Identify user conflicts (Proj)</p> <p>Determine visitor needs for facilities and services not currently available (Proj, Dist, Dist)</p> <p>Determine importance of attributes of recreation areas visited (Proj)</p> <p>Distinguish group vs nongroup activities (Dist)</p> <p>Measure customer satisfaction separately for 8 activities/markets: camping, visitor centers, reserved shelters, group use, beaches, picnicking, shoreline fishing, boating (Div)</p> <p>Track safety issues associated with theft, assault, vandalism, drowning (Div)</p> <p>National rollup of customer feedback (Div, HQ)</p> <p>Incorporate scenic/environmental values (Discussion)</p>	<p>Support management decision-making (Proj)</p> <p>Planning for modernization (Proj, Dist)</p> <p>Achieve and support an increased customer base (Dis)</p> <p>Identify and resolve user conflicts (Proj)</p> <p>Performance data, customer report card, benchmarking (Dist Div)</p> <p>To obtain customer suggestions for new services and facilities (Div)</p> <p>Determine consistency of recreation program (Div)</p> <p>Monitor quality improvement (Div)</p> <p>Identify where measures are needed to address safety issues (Div)</p> <p>Report Card / Program evaluation (Proj, HQ)</p>
Recreation Benefits	10	<p>Social impacts; community values, including economic values (Dist)</p> <p>Economic impacts in dollars and jobs to state/region/nation (Div, HQ)</p> <p>Fee receipts (Proj)</p>	<p>To be good neighbors; help address community needs through outreach, marketing, partnering (Dist)</p> <p>To create community/political support for Corps recreation programs (Dist)</p> <p>Help determine priorities for budgeting and modernization activities (Div)</p> <p>Program justification and public support (HQ)</p>

<b>Trend Information Category</b>	<b>Degree Of Interest<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Components/Questions / Issues That Need To Be Addressed</b>	<b>Rationale/Use of Information</b>
Recreation Technology	8	<p>Identify types/characteristics of boats, campers, and other equipment brought to projects by visitors (Proj, Dist)</p> <p>Determine facility demands of this equipment (Proj)</p> <p>Identify design standards to support this equipment (Proj)</p> <p>Identify latest in available recreation facilities, services and equipment (Div)</p>	<p>Help determine size and design of needed facilities (Proj)</p> <p>Support design of recreation areas to accommodate future use and activities (Dist)</p> <p>Support modernization; help identify and prioritize budget needs (Div)</p>
Ethnicity and Disability	4	<p>General demographic information specific for ethnic groups- such as party/family structure, age, gender, point of origin (Proj)</p> <p>Information to determine needs of particular ethnic groups- e.g., language usage, types of facilities used/needed, types of equipment brought to project. (Proj)</p> <p>Evaluate user conflicts and barriers to ethnic minority use of Corps projects (Proj)</p> <p>Determine demand preferences for activities, services, and programs (HQ)</p> <p>Consider above issues for disabled visitors as well as ethnic visitors (from discussion)</p>	<p>Meet the specialized recreational needs of ethnic minorities whose project use is increasing (Proj)</p> <p>Accommodate current and future use (HQ)</p> <p>Use for budget justification and resource allocation activities (HQ)</p>
Brand recognition	2	<p>What factors are important in choosing which recreation areas to visit? (Proj)</p> <p>To what extent are visitors aware of Corps as a recreation provider? (Proj)</p> <p>How does recognition of Corps as a recreation provider affect selection of recreation sites? (Proj)</p>	<p>Do our customers know who we are and does that mean anything to them? (Proj)</p> <p>Need to understand the role of Corps relative to other recreation providers. (Proj)</p>

<b>Trend Information Category</b>	<b>Degree Of Interest<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Components/Questions / Issues That Need To Be Addressed</b>	<b>Rationale/Use of Information</b>
Interpretative programs	0	Determine effectiveness of interpretative programs relative to their cost (Dist)  Examine role of interpretative programs in building a corporate identity among visitors (Dist)	
Visitor Perceptions of Corps' Stewardship	0	Is Corps perceived by visitors as a good natural resource steward? (Dist)  Perceived environmental effects of design options such as paves vs unpaved roads, allowable activities, etc. (Dist)  Develop "work with nature" recreation designs (Dist)	
Visitation	0	Quantify origin-destination associated with project visitation (HQ)	Program/budget justification (HQ)  Public Information (HQ)

<sup>1</sup> Seventeen individuals each selected three of nine information categories that were most needed to effectively manage the Corps recreation program. Overall degree of interest was indicated by the number of times each category was selected out of 52 "votes" cast.

ATTACHMENT 3  
RMSP WORK UNIT STATUS REPORT

<b>Task Areas &amp; Work Units</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
<b><i>RMSP Research and Management Studies</i></b>		
Measuring the Economic Effects of Boat Dock Permit and Marina Slip Holders	National marina report Refereed article National pvt. Dock report Spending profiles – marina Spending profiles – pvt. dock	complete complete 0009 0009 0009
Benefits-Based Management	National Benefits Report	0012
Recreation Infrastructure	Summary report on Facility Standards Committee support activities – public/industry outreach, sample designs etc.	0009
Study Plans		0009
<b><i>RMSP Management Assistance</i></b>		
National Recreation Trends	Annual trends report - national recreation trends - manager survey - agency trends - recommendations for monitoring CE recreation trends	0009
Customer Comment Card Maintenance	Electronic versions of - comment card - customer care kit - analysis software	0005
Design VERS Modification	Design guidance on VERS reporting patch	9910-0004
<b><i>RMSP Information Exchange</i></b>		
VERS/AUPS Tech Support	VERS responses – 213 AUPS responses – 9	Ongoing
Reports and Publications	1 issue RECNOTES competed 6 reports scheduled	Ongoing
Website Development and Maintenance	Initial website deployment	0009
<b><i>RMSP Program Management and Coordination</i></b>	Organized fall and spring meetings Input to recreation business area strategy	9910, 0004 0001

**April 2000**  
**RMSP – FY00 FUNDING**

**Summary**

Initial Allocation – \$ 485k – 9912  
 Supplemental 300k – 0003  
 Total 785k

Task Areas & Work Units	Principal Investigator	Funding (\$K)	
		Proposed	Actual
RMSP Research and Management Studies			
Measuring the Economic Effects of Boat Dock Permit and Marina Slip Holders	K. Perales	150	150
Benefits-Based Management	K. Perales S. Jackson	150	75**
Recreation Infrastructure	J. Henderson	150	(15) 75*
Study Plans		50	50**
Subtotal		500	350
RMSP Management Assistance			
Innovative Management Practices	S. Jackson	20	0
National Recreation Trends	R. Kasul	140	(95) 140*
Customer Comment Card Maintenance	R. Hamilton	25	25
Design VERS Modification	K. Perales	70	40
Subtotal		255	205
RMSP Information Exchange			
VERS/AUPS Tech Support	R. Hamilton	125	(100) 125*
Reports and Publications	R. Hamilton	35	(20) 35*
Website Development and Maintenance	S. Jackson	30	30**
Subtotal		190	190
RMSP Program Management and Coordination	S. Jackson	55	40
Grand Total		1000	785

\* supplemental funds provided 3/00 (initial funding)

\*\* all funds provided 3/00

differences between proposed and actual in bold

ATTACHMENT 4  
RESULTS OF PRIORITIES FOR NEW STARTS SESSION

Potential New Start Topics.. (**Votes - N=Non-Research R= Research in parenthesis**)

- = consolidated into other items.

1. George Tabb. Communications within the NRM element.  
Advent of SOS... we went to team concept... potential elimination of operations from division structure... we need to spend time on finding other ways to communicate within NRM element. **(0-N)**
2. Tom Peek. Develop recommendation for parking spaces associated with concession expansion...What recommendations can I give concessions for recommended parking spaces...2 slips have to provide 1 space **(1-R)**
3. Sandy Campbell. Conflict resolution/ management tools for pwc operations on CE projects... Everyone helps and people don't understand why we don't act... we refer them to another agency... **(5-R)**
4. Dan Troglin. Public's perception of Corps Rangers.  
Grad student... Smokey bear good vs. John Law **(1-R)**
5. Jimmy Carver. Concession Development "foot print policy" diminishing natural resource management... ducks unlimited... NPS has a foot print policy concessions can develop within the footprint.. **(1-R)**
6. Joe Sigrest. Measure for developing "density of Development" .. we have carrying capacity study... and tie to development... when is enough is enough.... **(7-R)**
7. Susan Shampine. Impacts of current hiring process on developing long term quality NRM employees. **(7-N)**
8. Mike Loesch. Customer satisfaction card for fee services. Need for other product... beach use, launch facilities... for the purpose of benchmarking, modernization, o&m and needs... **(1-R)**
9. Phil Turner. Study on the effect of recreation on project wildlife. **(2-R)**
10. Elisa P. Education/ Interpretation as a management tool. Has not been put into practice, into daily activities, vandalism, safety, stewardship, adherence to regulations. **(2-N)**
11. John Marnell. Park Rangers... Generalist or Specialists. And how that will effect long term career.. conservation/resource specialist... will this hurt me and for transfer... Job series... 401 series rather than 025 series. **(0-N)**



12. Don Dunwoody. Corps "2001" Plan. If there is an image problem, Corps 2001 plan with an interpretive emphasis... hit every school district at every county in every CE project... earmark every 4<sup>th</sup> grader in the country... what to say, how to say it... and improve the CE image... **(5-N)**

13. Tom . Wilderness camping experience. Room in many CE lakes to have a wilderness camping experience... ¼ mile, canoe or boat only, can enjoy quite, own water... similar areas, voyagers national recreation areas... **(1-N)**

14. Will Rogers. 225<sup>th</sup> anniversary June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2000. Time or life... one day of pictures...digital collection point... 4-5000 photographs... what the day was like in 2000... digital...maintenance, engineering, computers, tractors... and by the end of the fall and selected slides. **(3-N)**

15. Tom. Peek Increase shoreline use permit fees. Administrative or value. **(1-N)**

- Jimmy. Other competing water uses... pwc is majority of problems... rezone certain areas... fishing, water-skiing
- Susan. Concession development footprint policy... research into other agencies are doing in concession management and states... analysis of concession in national lake study..

---

16. Mike. Document that outlines overall needs of modernization program... **(4-N)**

17. Phil. Study to determine the success of the visitor /ranger safety initiatives. **(4-N)**

18. Elisa. Diversity and the sign program. Other languages and population programs...**(1-N)**

- Elisa... Carrying capacity and shoreline management.

19. John. Environmental effects of NRM work... Major vs. minor actions that need assessment..**(0-N)**

- Don. Attracting, obtaining expanding good concessionaires.

20. Don. Congressional interaction strategy as program manager.. field level can do this well... others don't know how to do it... how to present the information in our program to congressional people... **(4-N)**

21. Will. Workbook riders education... cookie cutter, here is how to put it on... course background.. police self... PWC instructors course handbook...**(1-N)**

- Ethnicity... interest in monitoring...Ethnicity statement of need... Bob Dunn... research findings.. on 4 major groups... tech notes... implications facilities and services... those were

preliminary findings... from focus groups... next step to go into more detail... and possibly branch out.. to single parent families and people with disabilities... plan of study..

22. Mike. Study of accommodating traditional and nontraditional (ethnic) needs. **(5-R)**

23. Elise. Internal education/marketing of the corps...employees are best face to the nation... administration... get the story out... One door to the Corps CD rom... any facet... tutorial... how corps formed... branches... interactive... in San Francisco....**(3-N)**

24. Elise. Information dissemination NOT ON web sites. Are we leaving a large part of our audience behind. People that do not have access to web and we need to be sure they are not left behind. **(2-N)**

25. Don. Training Program revived/revised for today's CE Rangers. Properly training rangers... **(0-N)**

26. John. Are there efficiencies of scale in recreation area design. Some folks talking or coming from training never build 75-120 campsites... basis?

Magnitude study... one of the last studies... talks about issue... 60-75-80 sites...**(0-R)**

27. Tom. Peek Standard marina amenities package for mooring customers.... E.g. sewage hookup at site... don't know if there is a standard or not... what should be required... required in lease... and can't put it in until lease renewal... **(2-R)**

28. Tom Peek. Carrying capacity studies.... Not just boating... Do we need to be inviting more people... or inviting different types... NRRS will redirect...Cherry creek: close gate at certain point... what is allowable... private docks.. marinas... houseboats.. **(2-R)**

29. PWC rental concessionaire minimum requirements. Business license... put in by real estate... Huntington... here is the guidance... anyone that does business on CE property... most thought it was too labor intensive... rock climbing, pwc... **(1-N)**

30. Marketing/name recognition... congressional support, ownership at all levels... international... not covered under number 6... telling vs. receiving... **(10-N)**